

PRINTER RUSH

(PTO ASSISTANCE)

HC Correspondence

Application: 09/700643 Examiner: NGUYEN GAU: 1641

From: OLA Location: IDC (FMF) FDC Date: _____

Tracking #: _____

Week Date: _____

2nd REQUEST

DOC CODE	DOC DATE	MISCELLANEOUS
<input type="checkbox"/> 1449		<input type="checkbox"/> Continuing Data
<input type="checkbox"/> IDS		<input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLM	<u>12/3/04</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Document Legibility
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IIFW	<u>9/8/04</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Fees
<input type="checkbox"/> SRFW		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other NOA <u>9/8/04</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> DRW		
<input type="checkbox"/> OATH		
<input type="checkbox"/> 312		
<input type="checkbox"/> SPEC		

[RUSH] MESSAGE: Claim Index (IIFW dated 9/8/04) does not reflect the approved claims dated 12/3/04 and examiner's amendment dated 11/17/05.

Please resolve.

Claimed

Also missing page 1 of

Thank you
OLA

[XRUSH] RESPONSE: _____

NOT A GROUP ERROR

See attached

INITIALS: BN

NOTE: This form will be included as part of the official USPTO record, with the Response document coded as XRUSH.

REV 10/04

Response to Printer Rush dated 12/05/2005:

- Q. Claim Index (IIFW dated 9/8/04) does not reflect the approved claims dated 12/03/04 and examiner's amendment dated 11/17/05.
- A. These documents don't agree because they are not discussing the same set of claims. The claim index (IIFW 9/8/04) refers to the set of claims dated 6/14/2004 NOT those dated 12/03/04.

On the other hand, the examiner's amendment dated 11/17/05 refers to the set of claims in the 312 amendment dated 12/03/04

IN THE 312 AMENDMENT DATED 12/03/04, APPLICANT USED THE CLAIMS NUMBERING THAT WAS INDICATED IN THE EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT DATED 9/08/04 (NOA 9/08/04). THIS IS WHAT CAUSED ALL OF THE CONFUSION.

THE EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT DATED 11/17/05 REFERS TO THE NEW NUMBERING AND IS CORRECT.

- Q. Also missing page 1 of claim set.
- A. I am assuming that this is referring to Claims dated 12/03/04. This amendment was not properly scanned and separated. Page 1 of the claim set is in A.NA dated 12/03/04.

SOLUTION: To avoid further confusion, I am attaching a complete set of claims using the claims as renumbered. The document that I am attaching here should be considered CLMPTO